

REMARKS

This paper is being provided in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 15, 2004, for the above-referenced application. In this response, Applicants have cancelled claims 1, 2, 8-11, 13, 15 and 16 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof, and amended claims 3, 4, 5, 6, 12 and 14 to clarify that which Applicants consider to be the invention and in accordance with the guidelines set forth in the Office Action. Further, Applicants have amended the specification and drawings for purposes of clarification. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims are fully supported by the originally-filed specification and that the amendments to the specification and drawings do not add new subject matter.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of the allowability of claims 3, 4-7, 12 and 14, subject to the informalities identified by the Examiner. Applicants have addressed the informalities of these claims by amendments contained herein according to the guidelines set forth in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are in condition for allowance.

The objections to the disclosure have been addressed by amendments to the specification contained herein according to the guidelines set forth in the Office Action. Applicants have added the appropriate figure references as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these objections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The objection to the drawings has been addressed by the amendments to the figures contained herein according to the guidelines set forth in the Office Action and as noted above.

Applicants have amended Figures 2 and 3 to include the reference numeral 104. However, concerning the inclusion of λ_{p1} and λ_{p2} in Figs. 2 and 3, Applicants respectfully submit that the paragraph beginning on page 6, line 17 that contains references to λ_{p1} and λ_{p2} was amended in the prior Response to correctly refer to Figure 4 in which is illustrated λ_{p1} and λ_{p2} . Figure 4 is the more appropriate figure utilized to illustrate clearly the subject matter of these reference labels. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all figures are accurate and clear and respectfully request that this objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 8-11, 13, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims herein.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 8-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,908,694 to Hidaka et al. (hereinafter "Hidaka") in view of Applicants' admitted prior art (hereinafter "Applicants' APA") is rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims herein.

The rejection of claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hidaka in view of Applicant's APA and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,617,946 to Kennedy et al. (hereinafter "Kennedy") is rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims herein.

Based on the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections and objections. Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. Should there be any questions after reviewing this paper, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at 617-248-4038.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART

Date: March 12, 2004


Donald W. Muirhead
Registration No. 33,978

Choate, Hall & Stewart
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Phone: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 248-4000